UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/559,703	12/07/2005	Reiner Fischer	CS8689/BCS03-3014	1859	
34469 BAYER CROP	7590 08/27/200 SCIENCE LP	EXAMINER			
Patent Departm	ent	SULLIVAN, DANIELLE D			
2 T .W. ALEXANDER DRIVE RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1616		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			08/27/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

blair.wilson@bayercropscience.com pamula.ramsey@bayercropscience.com rebecca.hayes@bayercropscience.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/559,703	FISCHER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	DANIELLE SULLIVAN	1616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>10 August 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the data of filing a brick	وعا لومسووه وعالم والنب	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	sideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	acted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	oted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all- non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, f	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>37-40 and 61</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>6/28/200</u>	<u>06</u>	
	/Mina Haghighatian/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1616	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's amendment has been entered because they do not add to the burden of examination and do not require further search. The amendment reduces the issues for appeal and do not raise the issue of new matter. Applicants argue that Lieb et al. teach the most preferred embodiments are those in which group Y is an optionally substituted phenyl, not a hetaryl. Hence, Applicants believe their invention is patentably distinct from Lieb et al., and the Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.132 is sufficient to overcome the teachings of the prior art. The Examiner is not persuaded by this argument because the comparisons are not made with the closest prior art. MPEP 716.02(e) states that the claimed invention must be compared with the closest subject matter that exists in the prior art, not the preferred embodiment disclosed in the prior art. Hence, because Lieb et al. teach Y as a hetaryl the closest prior art would be one wherein Y is selected from a hetaryl as disclosed in column 29 or Lieb et al.